RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 2 8 2006

OFFICIAL

CARDINAL LAW GROUP

1603 Orrington Avenue/Suite 2000 Evanston, Illinois 60201 Telephone 847 – 905 - 7111 Facsimile 847 – 905 – 7113

Date:

MARCH 23, 2006

To:

EXAMINER GARG, YOGESH C.

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Fax #:

(571) 273-8300

From:

FRANK C. NICHOLAS

Phone #:

(847) 424-2521

Client/Matter No.:

AUS920010193US1 (9000/34)

of Pages:

7

(including cover sheet)

IF YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS MESSAGE, PLEASE CALL 847/805-7111, Ext. 112 AND ASK FOR JENNIFER CRUZ

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED. IT MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT, OR TRADE SECRET INFORMATION WHICH IS EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAWS. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR AN EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE (AND ALL COPIES) TO US BY MAIL AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS. WE WILL REIMBURSE YOU FOR POSTAGE

MEMORY TRANSMISSION REPORT

RECEIVED

: MAR-23-06 04:13PM TIME

TEL NUMBER1: +18479057113

TEL NUMBER2.

: CLG FAX NAME

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 2 8 2006

FILE NUMBER

. 663

DATE

: MAR-23 04:11PM

· 15712738300

DOCUMENT PAGES

START TIME

: MAR-23 04:11PM

END TIME

. MAR-23 04:13PM

SENT PAGES

: 07

FILE NUMBER

. 663

*** SUCCESSFUL TX NOTICE ***

OFFICIAL

CARDINAL LAW GROUP

1603 Orrington Avenue/Suite 2000 Evanston, Illinois 60201 Telephone 847 – 905 - 7111 Facsimile 847 – 905 - 7113

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Date:

MARCH 23, 2006

EXAMINER GARG, YOGESH C. U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (571) 273-8300

Fax # from:

FRANK C. NICHOLAS (847) 424-2521

Phone #:

Client/Matter No.:

AUS920010193US1 (9000/34)

of Pages:

(including cover sheer)

IF 104 MAYE MNY PROBLEMS RECLIVING THIS MESSAGE PLEASE CHIM MESSAGE PLEASE PLEASE CHIM MESSAGE PLEASE PLEASE

THE MESCAGE IS INTERDED ONLY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED IT MAY CONTAIN PHIOLOGIC CONTROL OF THE MESCAGE IS INTERDED ONLY ON THE MESCAGE IS INTERDED ON A REPORT OF THE MESCAGE OF A REPORT OF THE MESCAGE OF

PTO/Sp023 (1-2-27); Appended for use through structo. Oxid 9961-9931 Printed sing Type-mark Office. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

		,,		UND		es Recución AGI de 1995 re								
	TRAN		_ ⊢	Attorney Docket						(9000/34)	CF	IVE		
		ORM	Application Number			09/821,066 CENTRAL FA								
	F		Filing Date				MA	D 2	2 20					
			First Named Inventor			KEITH	(, T. H	MA	π	<u>8 20</u>				
	(to be used for all con	(ng)	Group Art Unit			3625								
			Examiner			GARG, YOGESH C.								
				ENC	LOSU	IRES (check a	all t	nat apply)						
 	Amenament		Assig	Inment Papers				Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and interferences						
	After Fina	After Final				ing Sheets		Reply Brief						
	Affidavits	decisiation(s)			Atter Group	Allowance Comm P	TLATE(estiou to						
П	7				ACCO	on Routing Stip (P mpanying Petition	SB/69) and	Propnetary information						
	Status Letter					onvert a sional Application			-					
	One-Month Petition Time Request (du	ıp)		Chan	ige of Correspond	e Address		Additional Enclosure(s)						
	Express Abandon	·			Term	nina) Disclaimer								
	Information Disclo PTO-1449	sure Statement			Sma	ii Entity Statemen		旦]					
	Certified Copy of I	Phonty Docume	NI(S)		Requ	est of Refund								
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application					The Commissioner is nereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 09-0447 (IBM CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed. I hereby petition under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) for any extension of time required to ensure									
		×	that this paper is timely filed. Please charge any associated tees which have not otherwise peen paid to Deposit Account No. 09-0447 (IBM CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.											
					c	ALCULATION O	f F		іі Елціу			Large	Entity	
•	Claims After		Highe Previo		-	Present Exira		Rate		Aga1 Fee		Rate	Add Fee	
Тотаі		Minus				0		× \$25	5= 0]	x \$50=		
inaep.		Minus				0		▲ \$100	=	0		x \$200=		
	resentation of Mult	ple Dep. Claim]	+\$180	=		ļ	+ \$360=		
							_	total add'l fe		\$ 0	<u> </u>	total add'i fee		\$0
				•	RE OF	APPLICANT, AT	ΤΟΙ	RNEY, OR AC	SENT					
Firm or Individ	lual name	FRANK C. NIC Registration N CARDINAL LA 1603 Orrington	o. 33,98 w GRC n Avenu	33 DUP	e 2000)								
Signature Evanston IL 60201									Date	Мв	rch 23	2006		
			7		CER	RTIFICATE OF F	ACS	IMILE						
i nere To the	by certify that this c a U.S. Patent and	orrespondence Tracemark Of	is bein lice on	g trans this da	nitted mitted	via facsimile to (571)	273-8300				March 23	2006	
Signature FRANK C NICHOLAS/133,983)							Date <u>March 23, 2006</u>							

FTD/SB/21 (12-97), Approved for use distuigh 9/3000 CA/8 0031-0031 "wayte and trappairate Ottice. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMITTIES UNder the Pupper Reduction Act of 1945, no persure for toqueed to respond to a conscision of intertween varieties is displayed a mild CMB control tu-Moe.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Attorney Docket No.	AUS820010193US1 (9000/34)
Application Number	09/821,066
Filing Date	MARCH 29, 2001
First Named Inventor	KEITH K. T. HO
Group Art Unit	3625
Examiner	GARG, YOGESH C.

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)														
	Amendment				Assig	nment Papers				Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences				
	After Fi	nal	,			Drawing Sneets				Reply Brief				
	☐ Afficiavi	rs/declaration(s)	declaration(s)			ter Allowance Communication to roup			X					
_			Petition Routing Stip (PTO/SB/69) and Accompanying Petition						Proprietary Information					
	Status Letter					To Convert a Provisional Application				Post Card Receipt				
	One-Month Peution for Extension of Time Request (dup)				Change of Correspondence Address					Additional Enclosure(s) (please identify below).				
	Express Abandonment Request				Termnal Disclaimer									
	Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449				Smal	li Entry Statemer								
	Certified Copy of	f Priority Document(s)			Requ	est of Refund	<u>-</u>	П						
Response to Missing Paris/ Incomplete Application				The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 09-0447 (IBM CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.										
				I hereby petition under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) for any extension of time required to ensure that this paper is timely field. Please charge any associated fees which have not otherwise been paid to Deposit Account No. 09-0447 (IBM CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.										
	CALCULATION OF FEE													
Small Entry									Entity			Large (Enuty	
	Claims After Amendment		Previo			Present Extra		Rate	Add1 Fee		or	Rate	Add) Fee	
Total		Minus				0		x \$25=		٥		x \$50=		
Indep.		Minus				0		x \$100-		0		x \$200=		
First Presentation of Multiple Dep. Claim]	+\$180=				+ \$360=				
					total add'i fee		\$ 0		eet rops lator	\$0				
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT														
Firm FRANK C NICHOLAS or Registration No. 33.98 (ndividual name CARDINAL LAW GRO 1603 Orington Avenue					2000									
Signature Evanston, IL 80201								Date	March 23, 2006					
CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE														
i hereby cerufy that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to (571) 273-8300														
To the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on this date: , March 23, 2006														
Signature FRANK C. NICHOLAS(33,983)							-	Date: March 23, 2006						

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 2 8 2006

Patent and Trademark Office on March 23, 2006
(Date of Transmission)

FRANK C NICHOLAS (33 983)

Name of Appellant, assigned of registered representative

Signature

March 23, 2006

Date of Signature

PATENT Case No. AUS920010193US1 (9000/34)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent applica	tion of:	
КЕІТН К.Т) : HO)	Examiner: GARG, YOGESH C.
Serial No.: 09/8	21,066	Group Art Unit: 3625
Filed: MA	RCH 29, 2001	Group Art Cuit. 3023
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	AND SYSTEM FOR) RY MANAGEMENT)	Conf. No.:5343

REPLY BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22202-1450

Dear Sir:

Appellants respectfully present their Reply Brief on Appeal as follows:

March 23, 2006

Case No.: AUS920010193US1 (9000/34)

Serial No.: 09/821,066 Filed: March 29, 2001 Page 2 of 4

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Examiner has failed to prove a case of anticipation under §102(e). Despite all the Examiner's allegations, the Examiner's burden to prove anticipation is clear – each and every element of the claim must be disclosed by the reference in as great detail as claimed.

Claim 1 requires defining a database for indicating functional relationships between a plurality of parts; and searching the database to identify one or more groups of functionally interchangeable parts. Each of the Examiner's attempts to show either element fails, as Scheer never discloses any such database, and does not disclose any such detail in as great detail as claimed.

The Examiner cites to paragraphs 147 and 171:

[0147] To further facilitate the intelligent order falfillment planning procedure, for each line item within an order the agents may determine if the distributor has access to any equivalent products 302. In this regard, an equivalent product can be a product that has the same functions and/or features as a specified product. Preferably, the equivalency of functions and features is determined as a function of product definitions provided by the distributor. It is further desired that, if there are any supplier diversity requirements specified by the customer, these requirements will be taken into account when looking for equivalents.

[0171] If a line item cannot be filled using either the first or second aterations described above, a third iteration of the steps described previously may be employed wherein substitute items are considered 302. When substitute items are selected for consideration, it is preferred that the nems alematical as being substitutable be within customer specified parameter requirements (e.g., the customer can specify which item attributes can be varied and by how much). If the customer also has supplier diversity requirements, the sytern can take these into account when identifying suitable substitutes. If the use of substitute items does not produce a viable fulfillment plan, a further iteration of the above described steps may be performed if the customer has indicated a willingness to accept a back order delay for either a line term or for the entire order 308. In accordance with this fourth iteration, the delivery date will be modified as described previously such that the revised delivery time will be set to either the time from the best alternative that exceeds the original delivery time or the time required for a special order from the manufacturer if there exists no sourcing plan alternative using a manufacturer source. It is further noted that item substitution may cause the consumer case threshold to be exceeded. In this case, the customer should be presented with the selected third teration plan candidate together with the results of the fourth iteration whereby the customer may choose to either pay the higher price for the plan that will meet the delivery requirements or wait for the lower price with a backordered fulfillment plan from iteration four.

* MAR-28-06 10:39AM FROM-CLG FAX

March 23, 2006

Case No.: AUS920010193US1 (9000/34)

Serial No.: 09/821,066 Filed: March 29, 2001 Page 3 of 4

The Examiner has not proven his alleged anticipation. At most, Scheer discloses determining if the distributor has access to any equivalent products (¶147), but does not say how. Scheer discloses that a customer can be provided with an option to take a substitute (¶171) but does not disclose how to determine what products are substitutes.

It is quite well settled that a "claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). See, MPEP §2131. Without disclosing a database for indicating functional relationships between a plurality of parts; and searching the database to identify one or more groups of functionally interchangeable parts, Scheer cannot anticipate these claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-16 is requested.

March 23, 2006

Case No.: AUS920010193US1 (9000/34)

Serial No.: 09/821,066 Filed: March 29, 2001

Page 4 of 4

CONCLUSION

The Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-16 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: March 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted, KEITH K.T. HO

CARDINAL LAW GROUP

Suite 2000

1603 Orrington Avenue Evanston, Illinois 60201

Phone: (847) 905-7111 Fax: (847) 905-7113

Frank C. Nicholas Registration No. 33,983

Attorney for Appellants